

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 were pending in the present application. By virtue of this response, no claims have been cancelled, amended or added. Accordingly, claims 1-15 are currently under consideration. Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claim 1 is rejected as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, in the Office Action the Examiner asserts that the element of “an SRAM-controlled 2:1 mux whose output provides an $(m+1)$ st data input, wherein the 2:1 mux selects between a signal provided at one of the m data inputs and a signal that is not provided at one of the m data inputs” was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors(s) had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Figure 8 of the present application illustrates a 2:1 mux 899 driving a data input of a 4LUT 550 included in a logic element 700. 2:1 mux 899 includes a first input labeled A1 and a second input labeled X and a selection input labeled ®. Paragraph [0058] of the present application, in referring to Figure 8, provides that a “multiplexor 899 is added, and additional input 898 is added, which can replace the A1 input of the original Figure 2 diagram.” Thus, the “2:1 mux whose output provides an $(m+1)$ st data input. . .”, recited in claim 1, is described in the specification. Paragraph [0058] continues: “the input X can be taken from any nearby location in the programmable interconnect fabric.” Thus, “wherein the 2:1 mux selects between a signal provided at one of the m data inputs and a signal that is not provided at one of the m data inputs”, as recited in claim 1, is described in the specification.

Further, paragraph [0004] of the present application provides that “[l]ogic elements, including look-up table (LUT)-based logic elements, typically include configurable elements holding configuration data that determines the particular function or functions carried out by the logic element. A typical LUT circuit may include ram bits that hold data (a ‘1’ or ‘0’). However,

other types of configurable elements may be used. Some examples may include static . . . random access memory. . . .” Additionally, Figure 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,798,240, which is incorporated by reference (as patent application No. 10/351,026, see paragraph [0010] of the present application) into the present application indicates a 2:1 mux 465 also having an input controlled by a signal ®. Column 9, lines 19-30 disclose that this ® indicates a “memory element.” Accordingly, that 2:1 mux 899 illustrated in Figure 8 of the present application could be controlled by an SRAM would be conveyed to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art.

For these reasons, Applicant believes that claim 1 complies with the written description requirement and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Concerning the Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner explained that “the SRAM-controlled 2:1 mux” must be shown in the drawings or the feature canceled from the claim. For the reasons detailed above, Applicant believes that 2:1 mux 899 illustrated in Figure 8 of the present application shows the SRAM-controlled 2:1 mux recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant believes no corrections to the drawings are necessary.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claim 1 is rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Pedersen (U.S. PAT. 6,798,240). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Examiner cites to claim 35 of Pedersen as anticipating claim 1 of the present application.

Claim 1 of the present application requires an LE that includes “an SRAM-controlled 2:1 mux whose output provides an $(m+1)$ st data input, wherein the 2:1 mux selects between a signal provided at one of the m data inputs and a signal that is not provided at one of the m data inputs.” Nowhere does Pedersen disclose this element nor is this element obvious from any disclosure in Pedersen. And, the Examiner does not assert that this element is disclosed by or obvious in view of Pedersen. Accordingly, Pedersen cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 1 of the present application and Application respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 306812005200. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: August 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Douglas G. Hodder

Registration No.: 41,840
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018
(650) 813-4203